

**Matrix Model For Polyakov Loops,
String Field Theory In The Temporal Gauge, And
Winding String Condensation In Anti-de Sitter Space**

Furuuchi Kazuyuki

Harish-Chandra Research Institute

Chhatnag Road, Jhusi, Allahabad 211 019, India

furuuchi@mri.ernet.in

Abstract

It has recently been shown that the low energy dynamics of the large N gauge theory on S^3 at finite temperature reduces to a one-matrix model, where the matrix is given by the holonomy of the gauge field around the Euclidean time direction compactified on a circle. On the other hand, there is a prescription for constructing a closed string field theory in the temporal gauge from a given one-matrix model via loop equations. I identify the closed string field theory in the temporal gauge constructed from the above matrix model as effective closed string field theory that describes the propagations of closed strings in the radial and Euclidean time directions in the bulk. Then I argue that a coherent state in this string field theory describes winding string condensation, which has been expected to cause the topology change from the thermal AdS geometry to the AdS-Schwarzschild black hole geometry.

It has recently been shown that the low energy dynamics of the large N gauge theory on S^3 at finite temperature reduces to a constant one-matrix model [1, 2, 3], where the matrix is given by the holonomy around the Euclidean time direction compactified on a circle (which I will call thermal circle). One of the reasons that the study in this direction has acquired interests is that via the AdS-CFT correspondence [4] it is expected to describe thermodynamics in anti-de Sitter space [5, 6, 7]. There, at certain temperature a phase transition from the thermal AdS geometry to the AdS-Schwarzschild black hole geometry takes place. The transition was identified with the confinement-deconfinement transition in the gauge theory side in [6, 7]. One argument for this identification is based on the calculation of the Polyakov loop expectation value from the bulk side. It is given by the exponential of the (regularized) area of the minimal surface in the bulk space-time which ends on the Polyakov loop at the boundary [8, 9]. Due to the difference of the topology between the thermal AdS geometry and the AdS-Schwarzschild black hole geometry, the Polyakov loops cannot have expectation value in the former but can have in the latter. It has further been suggested by many authors that the change of the topology of the space-time is caused by the tachyonic closed strings winding around the thermal circle [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. To describe such condensation, it is desirable to have a formalism that describes quantum field theory of strings. Actually, there exists a prescription for constructing a closed string field theory in the temporal gauge¹ starting from a given one-matrix model [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] (see [22] for a review). It is natural to identify this as an effective closed string field theory which describes the propagation of closed strings in AdS in the radial and Euclidean time directions. The Polyakov loops are directly identified with the closed strings winding around the Euclidean time direction in this formalism.

In this article, I study the string field theory in the temporal gauge constructed from the matrix model obtained from the large N gauge theory on S^3 . I will argue that a vacuum state in this closed string field theory can be consistently interpreted as describing the winding closed string (non-)condensation in AdS space. The closed string field theory in the temporal gauge has been used earlier in [23] to construct a simple model that exhibits the AdS-CFT type correspondence via loop equations [24, 25].

The action of the effective matrix model for the Polyakov loops has a form [1, 2, 3]

$$S_{eff}(U, U^\dagger) = N^2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_k=m_{k,\mathbf{n}}N} c_{k,\mathbf{n}} \rho_{n_1} \rho_{n_2} \cdots \rho_{n_k}, \quad (1)$$

¹This parameterization of the worldsheet time was first introduced in [16].

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$, $m_{k,\mathbf{n}}$ is some integer and

$$\rho_n \equiv \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} U^n, \quad (2)$$

and U is a $SU(N)$ unitary matrix. In terms of the gauge theory on S^3 from which one obtains the effective matrix model, ρ_n is nothing but the Polyakov loop winding around the thermal circle for n times:

$$\rho_n = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} P e^{i \int_0^{n\beta} dx^0 A_0}, \quad (3)$$

where x^0 is the Euclidean time direction, β is the inverse temperature, and A_0 is the time component of the gauge field. P denotes the path ordering. The condition $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k = m_{k,\mathbf{n}} N$ is due to the Z_N symmetry $U \rightarrow U e^{2\pi i \frac{\ell}{N}}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N-1$ which the original gauge theory on S^3 had (I will concentrate on such theories in this article). The coefficients $c_{k,\mathbf{n}}$ are in principle determined by the gauge theory on S^3 one considers and depend on the temperature, and S_{eff} is real. The matrix model is given by

$$\int dU e^{-S_{eff}(U, U^\dagger)}, \quad (4)$$

where dU is the left- and right- invariant Haar measure of the $SU(N)$ gauge group.

The loop equations, or the Schwinger-Dyson equations, in the leading order in $1/N$ expansion are obtained as follows. From the right translational invariance of the Haar measure, one obtains

$$\int dU \frac{\partial}{\partial H_a} \left\{ e^{-S_{eff}(U e^H, e^{-H} U^\dagger)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial H_a} \text{tr}(U e^H)^M \right) \right\} \Big|_{H=0} = 0, \quad (M = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots) \quad (5)$$

where $H \equiv \sum_a H_a T_a$ is an arbitrary anti-Hermitian matrix and T_a 's are normalized anti-Hermitian matrices which span the N^2 basis of $N \times N$ matrices.² Since in this article I am mainly interested in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, I will neglect the subleading differences between $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$ gauge groups to avoid inessential complications. It is easy to incorporate them in the following arguments. By the identities for the $U(N)$ gauge group

$$\sum_a \text{tr} A T_a B T_a = -\text{tr} A \text{tr} B, \quad \sum_a \text{tr} A T_a \text{tr} B T_a = -\text{tr} A B, \quad (6)$$

one obtains polynomial equations (loop equations):

$$f_M(z_n) = 0, \quad (M = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots) \quad (7)$$

²The convention here is $\text{tr} T_a T_b = -\delta_{ab}$.

where

$$z_n \equiv \langle \rho_n \rangle \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} U^n \right\rangle \equiv \mathcal{N}' \int dU \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} U^n e^{-S_{eff}(U, U^\dagger)} \quad (8)$$

is the expectation value of the Polyakov loop winding n -times around the thermal circle. $\mathcal{N}'$ is the normalization factor $\mathcal{N}'^{-1} = \int dU e^{-S_{eff}(U, U^\dagger)}$, and hence $z_0 = 1$. For example, in the simplest case

$$S_{eff} = c_2 \text{tr} U \text{tr} U^\dagger, \quad (9)$$

one obtains

$$f_M(z_n) = M \left(c_2 (z_{M+1} z_{-1} - z_1 z_{M-1}) + \sum_{p=1}^M z_p z_{M-p} \right), \quad (10)$$

for $M \geq 1$, and similar equations for $M \leq 1$. Because of the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the Z_N symmetry the matrix model action (1), the total winding number of the each term appearing in $f_M(z_n)$ is M .

From the loop equations eq.(7), the tree level Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ of the closed string field theory in the temporal gauge is given as follows:³

$$\hat{H}_0 = - \sum_{\substack{M=-\infty \\ M \neq 0}}^{\infty} f_M(a_n^\dagger) a_M, \quad (11)$$

where $a_n^\dagger$ and a_n are the creation and annihilation operators for the Polyakov loop with winding number n , which I identify with the closed string with winding number n . They satisfy the usual harmonic oscillator commutation relation

$$[a_n, a_m^\dagger] = \delta_{nm} \quad (n, m \neq 0). \quad (12)$$

I assign winding number n to the creation operator $a_n^\dagger$ and $-n$ to the annihilation operator a_n . The $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the Z_N symmetry in the matrix model action (1) leads to the conservation law for the total winding number during the time evolution by the Hamiltonian (11). Typically, there is a propagator term, and the tadpole term is forbidden, as opposed to the case studied e.g. in [17]. Notice that the closed strings do not merge during the time evolution by the tree level Hamiltonian (11).

³The relative coefficients of f_M 's are determined so that they match with those coming from the Fokker-Planck Hamiltonian in the stochastic quantization, via the equivalence between the temporal gauge quantization and the stochastic quantization [18, 22]. See the appendix for a brief summary of the stochastic quantization and the temporal gauge quantization.

The first aim of the closed string field theory in the temporal gauge is to reproduce the expectation values of the Polyakov loops in the matrix model as closed string amplitudes:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_0} a_{n_1}^\dagger a_{n_2}^\dagger \cdots a_{n_\ell}^\dagger | \Phi_i \rangle = \int dU e^{-S_{eff}} \rho_{n_1} \rho_{n_2} \cdots \rho_{n_\ell}, \quad (13)$$

where $|\Phi_i\rangle$ is an initial “vacuum” and $\langle \Phi_f|$ is a final state in the closed string field theory. I will discuss more about them shortly. In the planar limit I am considering here, the amplitudes should satisfy the factorization property of the planar matrix model:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_0} g(a_n^\dagger) | \Phi_i \rangle = g(z_n), \quad (14)$$

where $g(z_n)$ is an arbitrary polynomial in z_n .

It is often the case that the choice $|\Phi_i\rangle = |0\rangle$, $\langle \Phi_f| = \langle 0|$ in eq.(13) is appropriate. Here, $|0\rangle$ is the usual harmonic oscillator vacuum satisfying $a_n|0\rangle = 0$. The bra vacuum $\langle 0|$ and ket vacuum $|0\rangle$ are assigned zero winding number. The above choice however is not appropriate for describing a vacuum where the Polyakov loops have expectation values, as I will explain below.

Before going into the formalism, I would like to comment on a physical view in mind based on the AdS-CFT correspondence: I expect that the time t in the temporal gauge quantization is related to the holographic radial direction in the bulk. Here, $t = 0$ is interpreted as the asymptotic boundary and $t \rightarrow \infty$ is interpreted as deepest inside the bulk.

With the above view in mind, I set the initial vacuum as $|\Phi_i\rangle = |0\rangle$ which describes the state with no closed string. The amplitude (13) is expected to have a well-defined $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Then by taking $g(z_n) = z_M$ in (15) and differentiating by t , one obtains

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_0} f_M(a_n^\dagger) | 0 \rangle = 0. \quad (15)$$

Let us take the (overcomplete) coherent state basis:

$$\langle \Phi_f | = \langle \Phi(w_n) | \equiv \prod_{\substack{n=-\infty \\ n \neq 0}}^{\infty} \langle w_n |, \quad (16)$$

where $\langle w_n |$ is the coherent state, i.e. the eigen-state of the creation operator $a_n^\dagger$ with the eigen-value w_n : $\langle w_n | a_n^\dagger = \langle w_n | w_n$. It can be expressed as $\langle w_n | = \langle 0 | e^{-w_n a_n}$. Plugging this into eq.(15), one obtains the loop equation (7). Therefore, the stable final state which is invariant under the time translation (this is the relevant part of the final state in the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit) is given by $\langle \Phi_f | = \langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$, where the set of the eigen-values $\{z_n^c\}$

satisfy the loop equations (7).⁴ With this choice the closed string field theory amplitudes reproduce the matrix model results, i.e. (14) has been achieved. Thus, whatever the physical motivations I have given to set up the formalism, the resultant formalism is justified by that the first aim of the construction of the closed string field theory has been achieved. There's no fundamental difficulty in generalizing this construction to the higher order in the closed string loop expansion.

ρ_n defined in eq.(2) is actually the n -th Fourier component of the density distribution $\rho(\theta)$ of the eigen-values A_{0a} of the zero-mode of the temporal component of the gauge field:

$$\rho(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N \delta(\theta - \beta A_{0a}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_n e^{2\pi i n \theta}. \quad (17)$$

A_0 is related with the unitary matrix U by $U = e^{i\beta A_0}$. As a density distribution, $\rho(\theta)$ must satisfy $\rho(\theta) \geq 0$, and it is normalized as $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \rho(\theta) d\theta = 1$. This also constrains the value of ρ_n as well as z_n^c . Also, if the matrix model action is real, one has $z_{-n}^c = (z_n^c)^*$.

The confined phase in the gauge theory corresponds to $z_n^c = 0$ ($n \neq 0$), i.e. the case where all the expectation values of the Polyakov loops vanish.⁵ In this case $\langle \Phi(z_n) |$ is nothing but the harmonic oscillator vacuum $\langle 0 |$. The harmonic oscillator vacuum $\langle 0 |$ is naturally identified with the thermal AdS geometry in the bulk in the current formalism, for the reason described below. This is consistent with the expectations from the known results [6, 7]. The closed string states with non-zero winding number cannot disappear into the final oscillator vacuum $\langle 0 |$ due to the winding number conservation originating from the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the Z_N symmetry of the matrix model. This is interpreted in the bulk as follows: In the thermal AdS topology, due to the non-contractible cycle around the thermal circle the total winding number is conserved. Thus the closed string with non-zero winding number cannot disappear into the vacuum in the bulk.

In the deconfined phase of the gauge theory, the Polyakov loops have non-zero expectation values z_n^c .⁶ If looked from the harmonic oscillator vacuum $\langle 0 |$, $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ with $z_n^c \neq 0$ is a state with winding closed string condensation. Since $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ is a superposition of

⁴The loop equation can have multiple solutions in the case at hand. Each solution corresponds to a closed string field theory expanded around each classical saddlepoint. Note that I haven't included non-perturbative effects in $1/N$ yet. It will be briefly discussed at the end of this article. Also see the appendix.

⁵For a class of models, $z_n^c = 0$ is always a solution for the large N saddlepoint equation of the effective matrix model, although it ceases to be the most dominant saddlepoint after the deconfinement phase transition.

⁶At each of the saddlepoints related by the Z_N symmetry.

the states with non-zero winding numbers, the closed string states with non-zero number can have overlap with it. Thus the closed string tree amplitudes with non-zero winding number in the initial state and the vacuum at the final state can be non-zero. On the other hand, regarding $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ itself as a new vacuum may correspond to absorbing the effect of the condensation into the space-time geometry. In this interpretation, there is no more string condensation because it has already absorbed into the geometry. Then, the topology of the new space-time should not have a non-contractible circle so that the closed strings with non-zero winding number in the initial state can disappear in the final state in the bulk. This is consistent with the expectation from the known results that the deconfined phase should correspond to the AdS-Schwarzschild black hole geometry which does not have non-contractible circle.

Thus, the final state $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ seems to capture the difference of topology in the thermal AdS geometry and the AdS-Schwarzschild black hole geometry. The identification of $t \rightarrow \infty$ direction with the direction towards inside the bulk nicely fit the UV-IR relation in the AdS-CFT correspondence, since the vacuum, or the phase of the boundary theory, is governed by the IR physics. Since the vacuum expectation values of the Polyakov loops z_n^c depend on the phase of the gauge theory, $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ is different in different phases. That the different space-time can be described as different states in the same theory is an realization of the background independence.⁷ At the level of the effective action (1), the change of the temperature does look as a deformation of the theory, since the coefficients $c_{k,\mathbf{n}}$ depend on the temperature. However, if one looks at it from the original gauge theory on S^3 , this is only the change in the temperature, the theory remains the same.

Finally, let us turn to the closed string field theory at finite $g_s = 1/N$. For this one should consider the following Schwinger-Dyson equation:

$$\int dU \frac{\partial}{\partial H_a} \left\{ e^{-S_{eff}(Ue^H, e^{-H}U^\dagger)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial H_a} \text{tr}(Ue^H)^{M_1} \right) \text{tr}(Ue^H)^{M_2} \right\} \Big|_{H=0} = 0. \quad (18)$$

Following the similar steps as in the tree level case, one obtains the full Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$:

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + g_s^2 \hat{H}_1, \quad (19)$$

where $g_s = 1/N$, and $\hat{H}_1$ has a form

$$\hat{H}_1 = \sum_{M_1, M_2 \neq 0} M_1 M_2 a_{M_1+M_2}^\dagger a_{M_1} a_{M_2}. \quad (20)$$

⁷See [26, 27] for a study on this issue in the string field theory in the temporal gauge.

The term $\hat{H}_1$ in the Hamiltonian introduces the merging of closed strings during the time evolution. If one considers at finite $1/N$, the saddlepoint values of the Polyakov loops are no longer exact. By the similar reasonings in the tree level case, the final state stable under the time evolution would be written as

$$\langle \Phi_f | = \mathcal{N}' \int dU e^{-S_{eff}} \prod_{\substack{n=-\infty \\ n \neq 0}}^{n=\infty} \langle \rho_n |, \quad (21)$$

if one allows to use the answer from the matrix model. This is because again in the coherent state basis the existence of the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit implies the loop equations, and the expectation values of the Polyakov loops should satisfy those. Once the non-perturbative effects in $1/N$ are taken into account as in (21), the ground state no longer allows a simple geometrical interpretation of the bulk space-time, but rather it gives some sort of quantum superposition of geometries [28]. I leave further study of those $1/N$ effects to the future investigation.

To summarize, in this article I argued that the tree level vacuum $\langle \Phi(z_n^c) |$ in the closed string field theory in the temporal gauge can be consistently interpreted as describing the winding string (non-)condensation in AdS space at finite temperature. The closed string field theory was constructed so that it satisfies the loop equations of the matrix model of the Polyakov loops. The condensation of the winding strings can also be interpreted as a change of the space-time topology in the bulk. The Polyakov loop expectation values in the matrix model was directly translated into the winding string condensation in this formalism. It is nice that the winding string condensation was described in the quantum field theory of closed strings. It is also nice that the temporal gauge quantization gives a way to understand how in the loop equations the differences of the phases in the gauge theory side is reflected to the differences in the bulk geometry.

Critical readers may think that the closed string field theory constructed above can describe at best what the matrix model can describe, and provides no new information. But in my view, the AdS-CFT correspondence looks more well defined in the CFT side, at least in the weak 't Hooft coupling region. In most cases we do not really have a satisfactory formulation of quantum field theory of closed strings, and not even sure whether such formalism exists. And the bulk space-time seems to be an emerging concept arising from the large N limit. It is possible that the AdS-CFT correspondence is not really a duality but rather a definition of the bulk theory by the boundary field theory.⁸ From this viewpoint, it is important to give descriptions to the concepts in the bulk in

⁸See [29] for a recent discussion on this issue in a related context.

terms of the gauge theory language. I hope the result of this article is a nice first step for the direct translation of the expectation values of the Polyakov loops in the gauge theory side into the winding string condensation in the closed string field theory language.

I also hope this study has shed some light on the background independence issue in the closed string field theory in the temporal gauge.

It seemed natural to identify the time in the temporal gauge quantization and the holographic radial direction in the bulk space-time. This point should be investigated further.⁹ In particular, relation to the minimal surface calculation in the bulk geometry should be clarified. It will also be interesting to apply the temporal gauge quantization to the full four-dimensional gauge theory.

The $1/N$ corrections should be also studied, as well as the cases where the double scaling limit is relevant and higher closed loop contributions appear even at $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, like those studied in [32].

Acknowledgments

I am very thankful to the people in India for the research I could do here.

Appendix

In this appendix, I briefly summarize the stochastic quantization and the temporal gauge quantization. The explanations on the temporal gauge quantization might not be standard. It is arranged so that it becomes suitable for the purpose of the current article. The discussions on the multiple saddle points at the end might not have been explored much before. One can find standard reviews in e.g. [22] and [33].

To illustrate the main points, I will take a simple example: A scalar field ϕ in zero-dimension. The application to more general cases would be obvious once the main idea is understood. What is of interest is the expectation value expressed by the path integral

$$\langle F(\phi) \rangle = \frac{\int d\phi e^{-S(\phi)} F(\phi)}{\int d\phi e^{-S(\phi)}}, \quad (22)$$

where $S(\phi)$ is the action and $F(\phi)$ is an arbitrary function of ϕ . The essential points of relevance in the stochastic quantization is to consider the following Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(t; \phi) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial \phi} \right) P(t; \phi) \equiv -H_{FP}^\dagger P(t; \phi). \quad (23)$$

⁹For earlier studies in this direction, see [23, 30, 31].

The probability distribution $P(t; \phi)$ satisfies

$$\int d\phi P(t; \phi) = 1. \quad (24)$$

The formal solution of the Fokker-Planck equation (23) is given by

$$P(t; \phi) = e^{-tH_{FP}^\dagger} P(0; \phi). \quad (25)$$

From (25), one obtains

$$\int d\phi F(\phi) P(t; \phi) = \int d\phi F(\phi) e^{-tH_{FP}^\dagger} P(0; \phi) = \int d\phi \left(e^{-tH_{FP}} F(\phi) \right) P(0; \phi), \quad (26)$$

where

$$H_{FP} \equiv - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial S}{\partial \phi} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}. \quad (27)$$

I have assumed that there were no boundary terms in the partial integration, which requires $e^{-S(\phi)}$ to decrease at $\phi \rightarrow \infty$ fast enough. Note that the differential operator H_{FP} is essentially the one appeared in the Schwinger-Dyson equations. The Fokker-Planck Hamiltonian H_{FP} can be made Hermitian by the similarity transformation:

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}S(\phi)} H_{FP} e^{\frac{1}{2}S(\phi)} = - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \phi} \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \phi} \right) \quad (28)$$

which manifestly has positive semi-definite eigen-values. After taking the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit, one is expected to get the stationary configuration:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(t; \phi) = e^{-S(\phi)}. \quad (29)$$

Thus

$$\int d\phi \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(t; \phi) F(\phi) = \int d\phi e^{-S(\phi)} F(\phi), \quad (30)$$

which is what we wanted to get.

The temporal gauge quantization can be interpreted¹⁰ as the equivalent rewriting of the above formula using the creation and annihilation operators $\hat{\phi}^\dagger, \hat{\phi}$ which satisfy

$$[\hat{\phi}, \hat{\phi}^\dagger] = 1. \quad (31)$$

¹⁰See [22] and references therein for the original construction motivated from a matrix model description of the discretized worldsheet.

One interprete the previous formulas as the “position space representation”:¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\leftrightarrow \hat{\phi}^\dagger, & \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} &\leftrightarrow \hat{\phi}, \\ f(\phi) &= \langle \phi | f(\hat{\phi}^\dagger) | \hat{\phi} = 0 \rangle, & \langle \phi | \hat{\phi}^\dagger &= \langle \phi | \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Then, one can “go back” from the position space representation to the operator expression:

$$\int d\phi \left(e^{-tH_{FP}(\phi, \partial/\partial \phi)} F(\phi) \right) P(0; \phi) = \int d\phi \langle \phi | e^{-t\hat{H}_{FP}(\hat{\phi}^\dagger, \hat{\phi})} F(\hat{\phi}^\dagger) | \hat{\phi} = 0 \rangle P(0; \phi). \quad (33)$$

where $\hat{H}_{FP}$ is identified with the Hamiltonian in the temporal gauge quantization. The final state of the temporal gauge quantization is defined as

$$\langle \phi_f | \equiv \int d\phi P(0; \phi) \langle \phi |, \quad (34)$$

so that one obtains the equivalence between the temporal gauge quantization and the stochastic quantization:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_{FP}} F(\hat{\phi}^\dagger) | \hat{\phi} = 0 \rangle = \int d\phi e^{-S(\phi)} F(\phi) \quad (35)$$

Since $F(\phi)$ is an arbitrary function, it must follow that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_{FP}} = \int d\phi e^{-S(\phi)} \langle \phi |. \quad (36)$$

The saddlepoint approximation is applicable, e.g. when recovering the Planck constant $S(\phi) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\hbar} S(\phi)$ and taking $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \phi_f | e^{-t\hat{H}_{FP}} = \sum_{\text{saddle points}} e^{-\frac{1}{\hbar} S(\phi_0^i)} \langle \phi_0^i |, \quad (37)$$

where ϕ_0^i 's are the saddle points. I took into account the possibility of multiple saddle points. Suppose one chooses to have a sharp initial distribution $P(0; \phi) = \delta(\phi - \phi_0^i)$ on one of the saddle points. In the $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit, one also obtains $\langle \phi_0^i | \hbar \hat{H}_{FP} = 0$ (see eq.(27) with $\hbar$ recovered). Then one cannot get sum over the saddle points in (37) but only $e^{-S(\phi_0^i)}$ for that one saddle point. This was basically what happened in the main text ($1/N^2$ played the role of $\hbar$). At the tree level, the closed string field theory was build on each saddle point. In a sense, considering each saddle point separately in this way is an artifact of $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit which leads to the limitation of the stochastic quantization with the sharp initial distribution $P(0; \phi) = \delta(\phi - \phi_0)$.

When applying the stochastic quantization or the temporal gauge quantization to the loop equations, the change of variables from the original matrix fields to loops is involved. See [34, 35, 36, 18] on this aspect.

¹¹In the main text I have used the coherent states which were more natural for the complex variables.

References

- [1] O. Aharony, J. Marsano, S. Minwalla, K. Papadodimas, and M. Van Raamsdonk, “The Hagedorn / deconfinement phase transition in weakly coupled large N gauge theories,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **8** (2004) 603–696, hep-th/0310285.
- [2] O. Aharony, J. Marsano, S. Minwalla, K. Papadodimas, and M. Van Raamsdonk, “A first order deconfinement transition in large N Yang- Mills theory on a small S^3 ,” *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 125018, hep-th/0502149.
- [3] L. Alvarez-Gaume, C. Gomez, H. Liu, and S. Wadia, “Finite temperature effective action, AdS(5) black holes, and $1/N$ expansion,” *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 124023, hep-th/0502227.
- [4] J. M. Maldacena, “The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231–252, hep-th/9711200.
- [5] S. W. Hawking and D. N. Page, “THERMODYNAMICS OF BLACK HOLES IN ANTI-DE SITTER SPACE,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87** (1983) 577.
- [6] E. Witten, “Anti-de Sitter space and holography,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 253–291, hep-th/9802150.
- [7] E. Witten, “Anti-de Sitter space, thermal phase transition, and confinement in gauge theories,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 505–532, hep-th/9803131.
- [8] S.-J. Rey and J.-T. Yee, “Macroscopic strings as heavy quarks in large N gauge theory and anti-de Sitter supergravity,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C22** (2001) 379–394, hep-th/9803001.
- [9] J. M. Maldacena, “Wilson loops in large N field theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 4859–4862, hep-th/9803002.
- [10] S. Kalyana Rama and B. Sathiapalan, “The Hagedorn transition, deconfinement and the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A13** (1998) 3137–3144, hep-th/9810069.
- [11] J. L. F. Barbon and E. Rabinovici, “Closed-string tachyons and the Hagedorn transition in AdS space,” *JHEP* **03** (2002) 057, hep-th/0112173.

- [12] J. L. F. Barbon and E. Rabinovici, “Remarks on black hole instabilities and closed string tachyons,” *Found. Phys.* **33** (2003) 145–165, hep-th/0211212.
- [13] J. L. F. Barbon and E. Rabinovici, “Touring the Hagedorn ridge,” hep-th/0407236.
- [14] J. McGreevy and E. Silverstein, “The tachyon at the end of the universe,” *JHEP* **08** (2005) 090, hep-th/0506130.
- [15] G. T. Horowitz and E. Silverstein, “The inside story: Quasilocal tachyons and black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) 064016, hep-th/0601032.
- [16] H. Kawai, N. Kawamoto, T. Mogami, and Y. Watabiki, “Transfer matrix formalism for two-dimensional quantum gravity and fractal structures of space-time,” *Phys. Lett.* **B306** (1993) 19–26, hep-th/9302133.
- [17] N. Ishibashi and H. Kawai, “String field theory of noncritical strings,” *Phys. Lett.* **B314** (1993) 190–196, hep-th/9307045.
- [18] A. Jevicki and J. P. Rodrigues, “Loop space Hamiltonians and field theory of noncritical strings,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B421** (1994) 278–292, hep-th/9312118.
- [19] M. Ikehara *et al.*, “String field theory in the temporal gauge,” *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 7467–7478, hep-th/9406207.
- [20] M. Ikehara, “The Continuum limit of the Schwinger-Dyson equations of the one and two matrix model with finite loop length,” *Phys. Lett.* **B348** (1995) 365–376, hep-th/9412120.
- [21] M. Ikehara, “String field theories from one matrix models,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **93** (1995) 1141–1144, hep-th/9504094.
- [22] M. Ikehara *et al.*, “A Note on string field theory in the temporal gauge,” *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **118** (1995) 241–258, hep-th/9409101.
- [23] V. Periwai, “Model of Polyakov duality: String field theory Hamiltonians from Yang-Mills theories,” *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 047701.
- [24] A. M. Polyakov, “String theory and quark confinement,” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **68** (1998) 1–8, hep-th/9711002.

- [25] A. M. Polyakov, “The wall of the cave,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A14** (1999) 645–658, hep-th/9809057.
- [26] N. Ishibashi and H. Kawai, “A Background independent formulation of noncritical string theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **B352** (1995) 75–82, hep-th/9503134.
- [27] N. Ishibashi and H. Kawai, “Soliton solutions in noncritical string field theory?,” hep-th/9606123.
- [28] J. M. Maldacena, “Eternal black holes in Anti-de-Sitter,” *JHEP* **04** (2003) 021, hep-th/0106112.
- [29] M. Hanada *et al.*, “Loops versus matrices: The nonperturbative aspects of noncritical string,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **112** (2004) 131–181, hep-th/0405076.
- [30] G. Lifschytz and V. Periwal, “Dynamical truncation of the string spectrum at finite N ,” hep-th/9909152.
- [31] G. Lifschytz and V. Periwal, “Schwinger-Dyson = Wheeler-DeWitt: Gauge theory observables as bulk operators,” *JHEP* **04** (2000) 026, hep-th/0003179.
- [32] L. Alvarez-Gaume, P. Basu, M. Marino, and S. R. Wadia, “Blackhole / string transition for the small Schwarzschild blackhole of $AdS(5) \times S^5$ and critical unitary matrix models,” hep-th/0605041.
- [33] P. H. Damgaard and H. Huffel, “STOCHASTIC QUANTIZATION,” *Phys. Rept.* **152** (1987) 227.
- [34] B. Sakita, “Field theory of strings as a collective field theory of $U(N)$ gauge fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **D21** (1980) 1067.
- [35] A. Jevicki and B. Sakita, “The quantum collective field method and its application to the planar limit,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B165** (1980) 511.
- [36] A. Jevicki and B. Sakita, “COLLECTIVE FIELD APPROACH TO THE LARGE N LIMIT: EUCLIDEAN FIELD THEORIES,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B185** (1981) 89.